



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Classical Association of the Atlantic States can be of profit to the new Association and in return can receive substantial benefit from it. On the one hand The Classical Association of the Atlantic States can offer to the new Association a ready means of communicating with its members, if they become members also of the larger body, and a depository for such of the papers presented at its meetings as have a wider appeal or are well worthy of preservation in printed form. The members of the new Association, if they become members also of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States and so receive *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, will have in the paper an outward and visible sign of their membership in a great body, devoted in common to a cause of lofty character and high value. Not all members can attend all meetings, even of a local body, but all can find time, if they will, to read a paper which comes to them at short intervals, giving news relating to the cause they have at heart, presenting fresh points of view regarding familiar things, bringing forward new matters, touching questions of the material available for the successful prosecution of work as well as proper methods of work, and indicating, as far as possible, the new books appearing within the classical field, and giving some indication of their value. The new Association can add materially to the membership of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States and so to the clientele of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*.

Once more, then, I give to those who have worked so hard and so long for the formation of this new Association best wishes for success, and I urge all those to whom it appeals for support to grant it that support, at once, without reservation. C. K.

PAUSANIAS AS AN HISTORIAN¹

The periegesis of Pausanias is regarded in two lights: first, as a description of the monuments of Greece, of inestimable value to the archaeologist; secondly, as a repository of myths, legends, love stories, tales of notable natural phenomena, and numerous facts of history, given either in the form of brief notes, or in extensive introductions and excursuses. Pausanias himself recognized these two aspects of his work as *θεορῆματα* and *λόγοι*. Robert, in his book *Pausanias als Schriftsteller* (1909), has emphasized the importance of the *λόγοι* which, he thinks, are usually skipped, but constituted, in the judgment of Pausanias, the chief merit of his work, whereas the monuments furnished merely a framework for the literature. For an archaeologist's estimate of Robert's view, see Professor David Robinson's valuable review in *American Journal of Philology* 31.213 ff. The problem has

been to a large extent to establish the relationship Pausanias holds to what is known as periegetical literature. This had its beginnings in the local histories of Ionia: year-books, chronicles, genealogies, and stories of the founding of cities. Charon of Lampsacus, the Lesbian Hellanicus and, especially, Hecataeus may be mentioned. Out of the efforts of these writers rose the work of the 'father of history', Herodotus, who reflects his predecessors in a marked degree; but the higher forms of history did not put an end to the local histories, which continued to flourish, and became especially common in the Hellenistic period. In a recent number of *Hermes* (48.194 ff.), Georgi Pasquali has discussed interestingly the extant periegetical literature of the Hellenistic age, which has lately been enriched by the discovery of a papyrus from Hawara, published by Wilcken. He traces a connection with the above mentioned Ionic literature, and shows a close correspondence with the periegesis of Pausanias. The points of resemblance between the latter and Herodotus are not due solely to Pausanias's direct dependence on Herodotus, but also to the department of literature. But Pasquali censures Pausanias for exceeding the limits of the traditional form of periegetical literature. We must, however, recognize that Pausanias was justified in taking a more comprehensive view of his subject, feeling, as he did, the need of supplying historical information to readers of his own time, the period of the Antonines. Accordingly, more than a fourth of his work is devoted to history. In undertaking to throw some light on his treatment of this, I hope to show that the scattered parts are largely held together by a plan.

Pausanias's periegesis, with its introductions, notes and digressions, gives the reader a survey of Greek history from the earliest mythological period down to the Roman conquest, and glimpses even of later days, to the times of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. How well Pausanias, if we include his brief allusions, covers the field of Greek history, may be seen by a comparison of his work with Peter's chronological tables, which, together with Abbott's *Skeleton Outline of Greek History*, containing genealogical tables, is serviceable in systematizing the scattered historical accounts, attached as these are to the monuments, cities and countries visited. In this way we can see that a plan of history runs through the whole work. Pausanias himself had the needs of his readers in mind. Many articles (and not merely the historical ones) are complete in themselves and might seem to have been intended for an encyclopedia, and it is interesting to find that about twenty reappear in Suidas, and that nearly everyone is almost literally transcribed. Numerous cross-references facilitate the task of correlating the dismem-

¹ This paper was read at the Seventh Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Baltimore, May 3, 1913.

bered parts and chronological sequence is shown by means of genealogies, chronological tables, an occasional Olympiad, and particularly by the use, as chronological points, of memorable wars and battles, which he could assume to be familiar, or which appear in connected accounts. While there was a certain antagonism between his historical and his periegetical plans, both were united in his aim to connect the past with the present. Thus the histories of Mantinea, Elatea and Thebes compare fairly well with the sketches of those places given in Baedeker, where also memorable wars are the chief links that connect the past with the present. But, whereas the frequent phrases *ἐς ἐμὲ, κατ' ἐμὲ* and the like were called forth (really or ostensibly) by the existing monuments and ruins, the Roman conquest was conveniently made the goal of his general scheme of history, which is revealed when we correlate the various introductions and digressions with the history of the Achaeans in Book 7, particularly with the sections dealing with the revival of the Achaean League, coincident with the invasion of the Gauls in 279-278 B.C. When Pausanias reaches this point (7.6.8), he does not really tell of a revival of the League, as Polybius does (2.40.5-6). He describes rather the general political situation in Greece, which favored the expansion of Achaean power: Sparta had been humbled at Leuctra and was held in check by Megalopolis and Messene; Thebes had suffered so greatly at the hands of Alexander that, even after the restoration by Cassander, the Thebans were unable to hold their own (i.e. against Sulla; cf. 9.7.4-5); and, while Athens enjoyed the good will of Greece, owing to her later deeds (cf. the Lamian war, and the prominence of Athens—according to Pausanias—in repelling the Gauls), she was engaged in constant warfare with Macedonia. Further, while the alliances of the other Greek cities were no longer existent, the Achaeans had a common council to direct their affairs and moreover had not suffered from war and pestilence (!), as much as had the rest of the Greeks (7.6.3 ff.), and had remained free of tyrants (! cf. Polybius 2.41.10), except Pellene. While this summary of Greek history explains the rapid expansion of the League, which began when Aratus freed the Sicyonians of their tyrant, it also shows us that the period of Greek history that he had particularly elected to treat Pausanias viewed from the standpoint of his Achaean history, which constituted the last chapter leading to the Roman conquest. All this and more will appear in the detailed exposition of the several books.

The Attica has no introduction, mythical or historical. All mythological and historical matter is introduced in periegetical notes and digressions; and, as the latter are largely concerned with the

Hellenistic history of Egypt, etc., not directly affecting Athens, they seem to occupy space that should better have been devoted to the description of monuments. Gurlitt (*Über Pausanias* [1890], 2-3) shows that the Attica appeared first as a separate publication, and points out an improvement in the style and composition of the later books, made possible by the employment of introductions. Robert (Pausanias als Schriftsteller) has a different view of successive publications and sees no improvement in style (cf. *Amer. Journ. Phil.* 31. 216). The more liberal treatment later of the monuments is indeed apparent; but in the matter of introductions and digressions, especially the historical ones, there is no steady progression. Books 3, 4, and 7 have long introductions and few or no digressions, presenting a striking contrast with Books 2, 5(6), 8, 9, and 10, especially with the last three, which have brief historical introductions and long digressions, the longest (in 10.19.5 ff.) filling over sixteen pages. The fact is that each of the ten books has its individuality. The Attica, without a formal introduction, awakens interest at the start. Even a condensed introductory outline of Attic history would have tended to become a general sketch of Greek history, which he preferred to give, in a fashion, in Book 3, as we shall see; besides, he desired to reserve space for his Hellenistic history. Hence he chose to give all of his historical matter in the Attica in the form of digressions. Further, the wealth of literary, as well as of monumental material, caused him to decide at the outset to give only selections of *λόγοι* and *θεωρήματα* (cf. 1.39.3); and he was relieved of the duty of giving any formal exposition of Athenian history down to the battle of Chaeronea by assuming a general knowledge of it in his readers, especially through a familiarity with Herodotus and Thucydides. While he could thus, in 1.8.5, pass by the familiar story of Harmodius and Aristogiton with the remark *ἐτέροις ἐστὶν εἰρημένα*, the above assumption did not prevent him from using these historians, especially Herodotus, and it lent zest to anecdotes, or other matter, that they do not give, as the story of *Δείαινα* in 1.23.2. In view of the attitude outlined above toward the earlier Athenian history, it is interesting to see how skillfully he manages to give a survey of that history in his enumeration of the monuments in the 'national cemetery' along the road to the Academy (1.25.2 ff.). A close examination of this seemingly bare outline shows that it was carefully constructed and presents a kind of prototype of later outlines of wars and battles, which begin in 5.4.7.

Gurlitt (*Über Pausanias*, 6 ff.) shows that already in the Attica there is an artificial topographical plan; further, from the condensed form of the digressions he inferred some historical plan

(5). The latter was also assumed by O. Müller (cf. Götting. Gelehrte Anzeig. [1824], p. 1912). We shall see that Pausanias was indeed working out an historical scheme from the beginning, and it is obvious that, in making the Roman conquest the goal of this scheme and, hence, the history of the Achaean League its nucleus, he was forced to let this historical scheme take precedence, to a certain extent, over the periegetical plan of making his selections of monuments according to a chosen topographical order; and, no doubt, he was thus prompted, at times, to slight important works of art and to seek occasions for introducing his Hellenistic material. This antagonism between the periegetical and the historical plans is more perceptible in the Attica than elsewhere. As Athens, having played only a minor part in the conflict with Rome, had been the center of the struggles between the Diadochi, Book I offered the most suitable place for a general account of the Hellenistic period, which justified, in a measure, digressions that treat more or less fully, or, at least, touch, the affairs of Sicily, Italy, Epirus, Macedonia, Thrace, Asia, Syria, Egypt and Cyrene. The very first note (1.1.1) concerns the small barren island named after Patroclus, the naval commander of Ptolemy II, who sent a fleet to the assistance of the Athenians in the Chrimonidean war, which is more fully treated in 3.6.4 ff. He thus introduces at the beginning the matter of Athens's warfare with Macedonia. We should have expected the more important island Helene to be introduced here (cf. 1.35.1). Probably other selections, which in themselves seem more justifiable, were similarly determined. Leosthenes and the Lamian War (1.3 and 1.25.4-5) receive fuller consideration than Conon and the battle of Cnidus (cf. 1.1.3; 2.2; 3.2). In 1.3.4 Pausanias alludes indirectly to the period with which he begins his account of the revival of the Achaean League (cf. 7.6.8), for in discussing the portraits of Xenophon's son Gryllus and Epaminondas, in a painting of the battle of Mantinea, he tells us that Xenophon wrote of the whole war: the seizure of the Cadmea, the defeat of the Lacedaemonians at Leuctra, the Boeotian invasion of the Peloponnesus and the alliance of the Athenians with the Lacedaemonians (Hellenica V-VII). Then in 1.4.1 ff. he devotes about three pages to the Gallic invasion of Greece and Asia, ostensibly to elucidate a portrait of Calippus in the *βουλευτήριον*, but really to familiarize the reader at the outset with an event that was to be used as a chronological point of reference. In 10.19.5 ff. he gives a detailed account of the Gallic invasion of Europe (the crossing of the Gauls into Asia is merely mentioned), which, he says, he intended to give in connection with Delphi, the scene of the greatest conflict of Greeks with the barbarians. This was therefore not an after-thought, as some suppose, and the sketch of the Gauls

in the Attica with its discussion of their country and names was evidently planned to serve as an introduction. Soon after, in 1.5.5, following an account of the ten eponymi of the Clisthenean phylae, omitted by Herodotus, he continues: *ὕστερον δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶνδε φυλὰς ἔχουσι Ἀττάλου τοῦ Μυσοῦ καὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου καὶ κατ' ἐμὲ ἤδη βασιλέως Ἀδριανοῦ κτλ.* These names are important in the architectural history of Athens; but he is not interested in that here, aside from a few generalities included in his eulogistic note on Hadrian (probably from an inscription), who is briefly treated just as, later, Attalus is curtly dismissed with a reference to his account of Lysimachus. On the other hand, he gives a long digression on Ptolemy Lagus and Ptolemy Philadelphus, after the latter of whom one of the phylae was named, his account dealing mainly with the history of Egypt. He justifies this digression with the lengthy statement (1.6.1), that since the history of Attalus and Ptolemy (Philadelphus) was too old to be remembered, and since the historians who had been associated with these kings had been neglected even sooner, therefore he proposed to tell of their deeds, and to show how the government of the Egyptians and the Mysians and the neighboring peoples had come to their fathers. This rather absurd reason for his digression is nothing but a rhetorical variation of Herodotus 1.1: *ὥς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται.* Such absurdities have their parallels in Pausanias (cf. 2.16.5; 3.1.9). But, if he desired to introduce Hellenistic history here, why did he not take advantage of the fact that two phylae had been named after Antigonus and his son Demetrius 306-305 B.C., which existed until 265 B.C. (cf. Thumser, Hermann's Lehrbuch, p. 775)? Biographies of these men, especially of Demetrius, would have given more of Athenian history, as he aimed to do (cf. 1.20.4; 1.25.6). A special reason appears when we combine with the digression on Ptolemy Lagus those that follow on Lysimachus, Pyrrhus and Seleucus, the latter including a brief note on Ptolemy Ceraunus. For it seems to be more than a coincidence that this whole group figures prominently in Polybius's demarcation of the period when the Achaean League was revived, especially as he described (2.41.2-12) as momentous the period between the time of Alexander and the demise of these rulers (excepting Pyrrhus), which gave a convenient suggestion to fill out this period with their lives; and, actually, Pausanias lets them follow in the very order in which Polybius mentions them, even including Ptolemy Ceraunus at the end of the life of Seleucus. Moreover, Pyrrhus is equally prominent in this con-

¹ In 2.41.1 Polybius says: It was the 124th Olympiad *ὅτε Πατρεῖς ἤρξαντο συμφρονεῖν καὶ Δυναῖοι, καιροὶ δὲ καθ' οὓς Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Λάγον καὶ Αντίμαχος, ἐπεὶ δὲ Σέλευκος καὶ Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Κεραυνὸς μετέλλαξαν τὸν βίον.*

nection in Polybius, who, beside noticing him in other passages, mentions his invasion of Italy (281 B.C.) at the close of the above passage (2.41.11), and so Pausanias lets his life follow that of Lysimachus, in which he plays a prominent part, introducing the digression of nine pages as follows: *Τὰ μὲν οὖν Λυσιμάχου τοιαῦτ' ἔγένετο· Ἀθηναίους δὲ εἰκὼν ἔστι καὶ Πύρρου.* This indicates that, although he had seen the statue elsewhere (cf. the Hitzig-Bluemner commentary on 1.11.1), he needed the biography here. Pausanias was happy in his selection of this interesting character and made it serve his general scheme. For, as he says, Pyrrhus was the first Greek to come in conflict with the Romans, and was encouraged by the memory of the fall of Troy and by the consciousness that he, a descendant of Achilles, was making war on the descendants of the Trojans (1.11.7 ff.).

The excursus on Pyrrhus ends with the remark that with his death terminated the *ἀκμή* of Epirote power, a statement which shows that he regarded these biographies in the light of general history, just as the life of Philopoemen in 7.49.1 ff. is referred to in 4.29.12 as *ὁ Ἀρκαδικὸς λόγος*. That the Gauls were also used by Polybius to mark the above period is shown 1.6.5, where he associates the crossing of Pyrrhus into Italy with their invasion, their defeat at Delphi, and their crossing into Asia. In 2.20.6, he associates Pyrrhus's invasion of Italy with their defeat at Delphi, to which he refers also in 2.35. Consequently Pausanias adopted the Gallic episode as a chronological point, to which he extended his general sketches of wars in 7.6.8, 8.6.3, and 10.3.4, which was made intelligible by the account given in 1.4.1 ff. How intent Pausanias was on introducing all the above mentioned history is revealed by the way he crowds it in at the beginning of the Attica, and by the way the interspersed periegetical matter serves to connect the several parts. When we glance over the whole, from the invasion of the Gauls to the death of Ptolemy Ceraunus at their hands, we seem to have a cycle beginning and ending with the Gauls as a kind of framework, an arrangement characteristic of Pausanias.

The importance of the dependence on Polybius above mentioned calls for a special notice. That, in seeking a history of the Achaean League, which was necessary for his plan, he selected Polybius's history as his source, is so natural a supposition, that, in view of the close agreements in the main part, that is, from the period beginning 200 B.C. (7.7.7), the burden of proof rests on those who would deny it. Of, course his familiarity with the statues of Polybius in Arcadia, and their eulogistic inscriptions cannot be cited as evidence; on the other hand his unsatisfactory description of Polybius's history in 7.30.8-9, where he writes *συνέγραψε δὲ ὁ Πολύβιος οὗτος καὶ ἄλλα ἔργα Ῥωμαίων καὶ ὡς*

Καρχηδονίους κατέστησαν ἐς πόλεμον, and proceeds to tell how Scipio profited by Polybius's advice, should not be regarded as showing an absence of first-hand knowledge. It is exactly in Pausanias's manner of reckless condensation when giving some chosen detail, here, the anecdote about Scipio, which may have been obtained, or inferred, from Polybius himself (cf. Polybius 38.22.3, ed. Büttner-Wobst). Besides, the passage continues with Polybius's rôle as mediator between the Romans and his countrymen, which was set forth in Polybius's history. A formal attempt to disprove Pausanias's direct use of Polybius in the Achaean history was made by C. Wachsmuth in *Leipziger Studien* 10.269 ff.; he found discrepancies as well as close agreements. While he admits the possibility that errors are due to Pausanias, and recognizes some of his independent work, yet he concludes that his account depends on an intermediate source. But when Wachsmuth attempts to establish characteristics of this intermediate source, we find that they are characteristics of Pausanias himself: belief in divine retribution, partisanship for the Achaeans and friendship for Athens, animosity toward the Macedonian rulers, a tendency to charge the downfall of the Achaeans to individual leaders, and fondness for parallels from Attic history. The lack of an exposition of the political situation we should better charge to the account of Pausanias than to any intermediate source. The polemic against Polybius, which Wachsmuth notices, could of course be expected of Pausanias, who, following his principle of doing justice to all the Greeks, could not sympathize, for example, with Polybius's attitude toward the Aetolians (cf. 1.4.4, where Pausanias describes their youthful vigor); his readiness to criticize his authorities is shown in the case of Herodotus, who was his *vade mecum* throughout. We must also bear in mind that Pausanias did not make excerpts mechanically, nor did he follow one source exclusively. This can be shown by contrasting the two accounts of Philopoemen in Suidas, the first taken bodily from Polybius, the second almost literally from Pausanias, with Pausanias's free handling of Plutarch's Philopoemen, with which he combined other matter. Gurlitt (*Über Pausanias*, 29) happily describes Pausanias's method as "einstheils ein Auseinanderreißen, anderseits ein musivisches Zusammenarbeiten". We may, finally, call attention to Pausanias's date (140 B.C.) for the conclusion of the war (cf. 7.16.10), which is incorrect if taken for the conclusion of hostilities (146 B.C.); but the reader can accept it for the end of the period of adjustment; and, significant for our purpose, it coincides with the end of Polybius's history (cf. Unger, *Philologus* 55 [1896], 74 ff.).

(To be concluded)

GOUCHER COLLEGE, Baltimore, Md. HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.